

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONDALISA LEGRAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-05815-TSH

**ORDER RE MOTION TO SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 106

In ECF No. 106, Plaintiff filed a motion to consider whether Abbott's materials should be sealed in connection with Plaintiff's reply in support of her motion for leave to amend the complaint. The motion concerns Plaintiff's reply brief and Exhibits 1-4. Abbott responded in ECF No. 111, arguing that Exhibits 1 and 3 should be filed under seal, and that portions of Exhibit 2 and the reply brief should be filed under seal.

Because Abbott does not seek to seal Exhibit 4, the motion is **DENIED** as to that exhibit, and the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file it in the public record.

Abbott's proposed redactions to Exhibit 2 and the reply brief do not satisfy the standards for a motion to seal. The Court **DENIES** the motion as to those documents and **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file them in the public record.

For Exhibit 1, Abbott may redact the bar graph (that contains financial information) at the top of the exhibit between the two pictures of people, and for Exhibit 3, Abbott may redact the sales information at the top next to the two pictures of people, but that's it. The Court **ORDERS** Abbott to file those exhibits in the public record with only those redactions.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 4, 2025

  
THOMAS S. HIXSON  
United States Magistrate Judge